REMARKS

Summary of the Amendment

Upon entry of the above amendment, the specification and claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 11-14 will have been amended. Claim 2 will have been canceled and claim 26 will have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 and 26 will be pending with claims 1, 14 and 26 being in independent form. Reconsideration of the Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Support for Claim Amendments and New Claim 26

Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in, e.g., Figs. 4 and 5 which show, by way of non-limiting example, the use of single-type air gap non-conductive regions (Fig. 4) and single-type material non-conductive regions (Fig. 5). Figs. 4 and 5 also show that these non-conductive regions separating the conductive regions extending to the inner edges of the conductive regions. Finally, support for new claim 26 can be found in, e.g., Figs. 3 and 4 and the description thereof on paragraphs [0024] – [0036]. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Summary of the Official Action

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 11 and 12. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-17 over the art of record. By the present amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

The Objection to the Claims is Moot

Applicant submits that the objection of claims 11 and 12 is moot.

Consistent with the Examiner's comments, Applicant has, in an effort to advance prosecution, amended claims 11 and 12 in an effort to resolve this basis of objection.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection of the above-noted claims.

Traversal of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 7, 9 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 6,432,760 to KOTHANDARAMAN et al.

The Examiner asserted that KOTHANDARAMAN discloses or suggests all the features recited in these claims including the recited insulating film/polysilicon film, the

conductive regions and the non-conductive regions/strips. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Notwithstanding the Office Action assertions as to what KOTHANDARAMAN discloses, Applicant submits that KOTHANDARAMAN fails to disclose, or even suggest, for example, at least two conductive regions partially covering the insulating film; and, at least one single-type non-conductive region on the insulating film separating and extending to inner edges of the at least two conductive regions (claim 1), or non-conductive regions separating the plurality of separate conductive regions and each non-conductive region extending to inner edges of adjacent separate conductive regions (claim 14).

KOTHANDARAMAN apparently discloses conductive regions 16 arranged on a insulating film 11 and three non-conductive regions 17, 18, and 17 arranged therebetween. However, it is clear from a fair reading of KOTHANDARAMAN (i.e., Fig. 2) that the non-conductive regions 17, 18 and 17 constitute two different materials and/or region types (i.e., 17 is an oxide and 18 is a Low K silicon) and to do constitute a single-type non-conductive region which extends to inner edges of the at least two conductive regions 16 (claim 1). The Examiner has not identified any language or figure in KOTHANDARAMAN which specifically discloses this feature.

It is also clear from a fair reading of KOTHANDARAMAN (i.e., Fig. 2) that the

non-conductive regions 17, 18 and 17 constitute two different type regions or materials and/or three distinct regions (i.e., 17 is an oxide and 18 is a Low K silicon) and to do constitute non-conductive regions which separate the plurality of separate conductive regions such that each non-conductive region extends to inner edges of adjacent separate conductive regions (claim 14). The Examiner has not identified any language or figure in KOTHANDARAMAN which specifically discloses this feature.

Thus, Applicant submits that the above-noted claims are not disclosed, or even suggested, by any proper reading of KOTHANDARAMAN.

Moreover, Applicant submits that dependent claims 7, 9, and 15-17 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims and because these claims recite additional features that further define the present claimed invention. In particular, Applicant submits that no proper reading of KOTHANDARAMAN discloses or even suggests, in combination, the features recited in claims 7, 9 and 15-17 in combination with the features recited in claims 1 and 14.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Traversal of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Over Giust

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0155629 to GIUST et al.

The Examiner asserted that GIUST discloses or suggests all the features recited in these claims including the recited insulating film 32, the conductive regions 34 and the non-conductive region 124. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Notwithstanding the Office Action assertions as to what GIUST discloses, Applicant submits that GIUST fails to disclose, or even suggest, for example, at least two conductive regions partially covering the insulating film and at least one single-type non-conductive region on the insulating film separating and extending to inner edges of the at least two conductive regions (claim 1).

GIUST apparently discloses a conductive region 34 arranged on a insulating film 32. However, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not established that the "non-conductive region" 126 is in fact non-conductive. Applicant notes that GIUST describes the region 126 as an explosive region and it is not clear that such a region can arguably be said to constitute a non-conductive region. It is also clear from a fair reading of GIUST (i.e., Fig. 18) that what the Examiner also characterizes a non-conductive region 134 occurs only after the fuse is blown. As the device shown in Fig. 18 is no longer a fuse,

Applicant submits that it cannot anticipate a claim which specifically recites an electronic fuse (claim 1). The Examiner has not identified any language or figure in GIUST which specifically discloses this feature.

Thus, Applicant submits that the above-noted claims are not disclosed, or even suggested, by any proper reading of GIUST.

Moreover, Applicant submits that dependent claims 3-10 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from an allowable base claim and because these claims recite additional features that further define the presently claimed invention. In particular, Applicant submits that no proper reading of GIUST discloses or even suggests, in combination, the features recited in claims 3-10 in combination with the features recited in claim 1.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Over Anthony

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by published U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0062590 to ANTHONY.

The Examiner asserted that ANTHONY discloses or suggests all the features

recited in these claims including the recited insulating film 110, the conductive regions 130 and the non-conductive regions 120 and 185. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Notwithstanding the Office Action assertions as to what ANTHONY discloses, Applicant submits that ANTHONY fails to disclose, or even suggest, for example, at least two conductive regions partially covering the insulating film and at least one single-type non-conductive region on the insulating film separating and extending to inner edges of the at least two conductive regions (claim 1), or non-conductive regions separating the plurality of separate conductive regions and each non-conductive region extending to inner edges of adjacent separate conductive regions (claim 14).

ANTHONY apparently discloses conductive regions 130 and non-conductive regions 120. However, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not established that the so-caller non-conductive region 185 is in fact non-conductive. It is also clear from a fair reading of ANTHONY (i.e., Fig. 2G and paragraph [0038]) that what the Examiner characterizes an insulating film 110 is in fact disclosed as being a bottom conductor. As the device shown in Fig. 2G does not utilize an insulating film in the location of the device labeled 110, Applicant submits that it cannot anticipate a claim which specifically recites an insulating film (claim 1). The Examiner has not identified any language or figure in ANTHONY which specifically discloses this feature.

It is also clear from a fair reading of ANTHONY (i.e., Fig. 2G) that the non-conductive regions 120 are not arranged to separate the conductive regions 130 (claim 14) and are instead disclosed as being located on opposite sides thereof. The Examiner has not identified any language or figure in ANTHONY which specifically discloses this feature.

Thus, Applicant submits that the above-noted claims are not disclosed, or even suggested, by any proper reading of ANTHONY.

Moreover, Applicant submits that dependent claims 3-7, 9-13 and 15-17 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims and because these claims recite additional features that further define the present invention. In particular, Applicant submits that no proper reading of ANTHONY discloses or even suggests, in combination, the features recited in claims 3-7, 9-13 and 15-17 in combination with the features recited in claims 1 and 14.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

New Claim is also Allowable

Applicant submits that the new claim 26 is allowable over the applied art of record. Specifically, claim 26 recites a combination of features which are clearly not disclosed or

suggested by the applied art of record. Specifically, Applicant submits that the applied documents fail to disclose or suggest, for example, multiple conductive strips and multiple non-conductive regions in combination with the first and second fuse strips.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of this claim and further request that the above-noted claim be indicated as being allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's invention, as recited in each of the pending claims. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out. Further, any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto. Reconsideration of the Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

P26901.A01

Authorization is hereby given to refund excess payments and charge any additional fee necessary to have this paper entered to Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,
S. H. VOLDMAN

Andrew M. Calderon
Reg. No. 38,093

March 10, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
703-716-1191